

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Applicati n N .

09/819,477

Applicant(s)

ZAWADZKI ET AL.

Examiner

Dionne A. Walls

Art Unit

1731

All Participants:**Status f Application:** Non-Final(1) Dionne A. Walls.

(3) _____.

(2) Stan Antolin.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 May 2003**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Those of Record

Claims discussed:

Those of Record

Prior art documents discussed:

*None***Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature) _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) _____

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner discussed with Applicant's representative, Mr. Stan Antolin, the possibility of clarifying the claims by changing the preamble to recite that the claims are drawn to a "population of smoking articles" or "a method of making a population of smoking articles" in order to reflect the recitation of the allowable subject matter in the claim limitations, said subject matter being based on the smoking article being a member of a "population" of smoking articles - which is a plurality of articles. While Examiner had previously indicated, in a prior Office Action, that this limitation would make the smoking article/wrapper claims allowable, she acknowledged that she now believed the limitations would only place the claims in condition for allowance if said claims were also drawn to a "population of smoking articles" (or a method of making same). Mr. Antolin indicated that he would need to discuss the proposed suggestions with the Applicant. Unfortunately, the issues were unable to be resolved before the deadline, so, it was agreed that further discussions would resume upon Applicant's receipt of an Office Action - which would articulate Examiner's position and offer suggestions for placing the Application in condition for allowance. .